

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 20, 21 and 24 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-24 remain pending in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the continued indication of the allowance of claim 19 and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 13 and 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-12, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Mehra et al. article “Designing a flexible services-based architecture for Internet Applications” (hereafter “Mehra”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,175 to Abjanic (hereafter “Abjanic”). Claim 1, as amended to incorporate the recitations of claim 5, recites that an interface for interfacing between front-end data processing systems and back-end data processing systems, the interface comprising, *inter alia*, an engine, a node layer comprising at least one node, and a utility layer comprising at least one utility, and in which the engine comprises means for using the exposed node business logic capabilities to automatically build a process map linking received request messages with nodes, wherein the engine uses the process map to select the relevant node from the plurality of nodes, the process map comprising script messages, each message specifying an associated node, a list of the parameters the node uses

to perform operations based on the received request messages, and values which it returns for a type of incoming message.

In the Response to Arguments, it was asserted that the pattern requirements in Abjanic correspond to the parameters required for each node. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

As disclosed in column 7, lines 5-33, of Abjanic, if a certain criteria is met, then a message is directed to a particular server. For example, if the message is for bookstore.com, then it is directed to server S1; if the message is for stockquote.com, then it is directed to server S2; and if the message is for computerstore.com, then it is directed to server S3.

These criteria, however, are merely conditions for identifying which server should receive the message. The criteria, however, are not parameters that the receiving server uses to perform operations based on the received request messages. Indeed, the parameters used to select a server (or node) appropriate for processing a message is completely different from the parameters that the node uses to perform operations on the received request messages.

Accordingly, even if combinable, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Mehra and Abjanic. Claims 2-4, 6-12, and 15-18 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Mehra and Abjanic by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 20, 21, 23, and 24 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Mehra and Abjanic for reasons analogous to claim 1.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehra and Abjanic further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,434,555 to Frolund et al. (hereafter “Frolund”). Even if combinable with Mehra and Abjanic, Frolund fails to cure their deficiencies. Like Mehra and Abjanic, Frolund fails to disclose or suggest a process map comprising script messages, each message specifying an associated node, a list of the parameters the node requires to perform operations based on the received request messages, and values which it returns for a type of incoming message. Accordingly, even if combinable, claim 14 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Mehra, Abjanic, and Frolund by virtue of its dependence from claim 1, as well as its additional recitations.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Date: February 13, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Customer Number: 22428

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874
Marc K. Weinstein
Registration No. 43,250
Attorneys for Applicants